## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

<b>United States of America,</b>	) CASE NO. 5:12 CR 84
Plaintiff/Respondent,	JUDGE PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN
Vs.	)
Gillett L. Jones,	) <u>Memorandum of Opinion and Order</u>
Defendant/Petitioner.	)

This matter is before the Court upon petitioner's Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence (Doc. 10). In his motion, petitioner relies on *Johnson v*. *United States*, 135 S. Ct. 2551, 2563 (2015), to argue that he was unconstitutionally sentenced as a career offender under the residual clause of U.S.S.G. § 4B2(a)(2). In *Johnson*, the United States Supreme Court struck down the analogous residual clause of the Armed Career Criminal Act's definition of a "violent felony" as void for vagueness. More recently, however, the Supreme Court held in *Beckles v. United States*, – U.S. –, – S. Ct. –, 2017 WL 855781 (U.S. Mar. 6, 2017), that the United States Sentencing Guidelines are not subject to a vagueness

Case: 5:12-cr-00084-PAG Doc #: 14 Filed: 03/21/17 2 of 2. PageID #: 93

challenge under the Due Process Clause. Thus, Johnson's vagueness holding does not apply to

the Sentencing Guideline provision under which petitioner was sentenced. Petitioner's motion

is, therefore, DENIED.

Furthermore, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from

this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis upon which to issue a

certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253; Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Patricia A.Gaughan

PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN

United States District Judge

2

Dated: 3/21/17